

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/672,558	SCHIETINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Roy M. Punnoose	2877	

All Participants:

(1) Roy M. Punnoose.

(2) Attorney Eric K. Proul (Reg. No. 45,025).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 September 2004

Time: 2:30 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None.

Claims discussed:

Claim 1

Prior art documents discussed:

None.

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Attorney Proul agreed to an examiner's amendment to include cross-references to related applications in the specification and to correct duplication of lines 6 and 7 in claim 1.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)